



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,319	06/12/2001	Mark Crosbie	10004512-1	2127

7590 05/11/2006

IP Administration  
Legal Department, M/S 35  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER
----------

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006



Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/878,319

Applicant(s)

CROSBIE ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

## All Participants:

(1) Pramila Parthasarathy.

(2) Randy Noranbrock.

Status of Application: Claims 1-43 are pending.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 9 May 2006

Time: 2:15pm

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

29

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amendment (1/18/2005) to Claim 29 was discussed in light of the specification on Page 36. Examiner agrees with the Applicant that limitation "wherein if a directory is specifically excluded and a file in the specifically excluded directory is specifically included then the file is monitored" is supported in the instant specification..